中英語における *To* Filter の妥当性

岸 田 直 子

The Validity of *To* Filter in Middle English

Naoko Kishida

A "bare" infinitival construction (an infinitive with no complementizer) has a much wider distribution in Middle English than in presentday English. Below are shown the examples of this construction we find in presentday English.[1]

(1)　John promised Bill to leave.

(2)　John asked Bill to leave.

(3)　We appealed to Bill to leave.

(4)　We want Bill to win.

(5)　We'd prefer (for) John to leave.

(6)　John believes Bill to be incompetent.

(7)　There is a man to fix the sink at the front door.

There are contexts in which this construction is not allowed. See the sentences below.

(8)　*It is illegal John to take part.

(9)　*It is likely John to take part.

(10)　*It is certain John to take part.

(11)　his plan *(for) Bill to win

(12)　It bothers me *(for) Bill to win.

(13)　It is preferred *(for) Bill to take part.

(14)　I want very much *(for) Bill to win.

(15)　I received a book on Tuesday *(for) you to read.

(16)　*(For) John to be successful would be preferred.

(17)　*(For) John to be successful would be unlikely.

(18)　I thought up a topic *(for) you to work on.

The presence of *for* is required in these sentences.

I will introduce the framework of Chomsky and Lasnik's core grammar, and explain how they analyze various infinitival constructions in presentday English.

(19)　Chomsky and Lasnik's core grammar

　　　1.　Base

　　　2.　Transformations (movement, adjunction, substitution)

　　　3a.　Deletion　　　3b.　Construal

　　　4a.　Filters　　　　4b.　Quantifier interpretation, etc.

　　　5a.　Phonology

　　　6a.　Stylistic rules

　　　　　　　　　　　(Chomsky and Lasnik 1977 : 431)

　　　The rules of the base generate base structures, which are converted to surface structures by the transformations of 2. These surface structures then undergo semantic interpretation by the rules of 3b, 4b, etc. Independently, they are mapped into UP by the rules 3a, 4a, 5a, and 6a. Deletion does not precede construal, etc., since deleted elements must undergo semantic interpretation. The transformational rules of the core grammer are unordered and optional. The consequences of ordering, obligatoriness, and contextual dependency can be captured in terms of surface filters. (Chomsky and Lasnik 1977 : 431-433)

　　　The rules shown below are needed to derive infinitival constructions. Among them, (20) and (21) are base rules.

　　　　　(20)　$\bar{S} \to$ COMP S

　　　　　(21)　　a. COMP $\to \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \pm WH \\ for \\ \phi \end{array} \right\}$.

　　　　　　　　b. $-$WH is realized as *that*

　　　　　　　　(Chomsky and Lasnik 1977 : 456)

　　　　　(22)　Transformation : Move NP

　　　　　　　　(Chomsky and Lasnk 1977 : 432)

　　　　　(23)　In the domain COMP, delete [α φ], where α is an arbitrary category and φ an arbitrary structure.

　　　　　　　　(Chomsky and Lasnik 1977 : 466)

　　　Now I will explain how Chomsky and Lasnik analyze the infinitival constructions mentioned above. The sentences (1), (2) and (3) belong to the structure of obligatory control. PRO (=an empty NP without a fixed index) must be present in this kind of structure. Thus see (24), (25) and (26).

　　　　　(24)　John promised Bill [$\bar{s}$[$_s$PRO to leave]]

　　　　　(25)　John asked Bill [$\bar{s}$[$_s$PRO to leave]]

　　　　　(26)　we appealed to Bill [$\bar{s}$[$_s$PRO to leave]]

The structure (27) is the structure of obligatory control where lexical NPs cannot appear in the place of PRO.

　　　　　(27)　V $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} NP \\ pp \end{array} \right\}$ [PRO to VP]

A rule of control (one of the construal rules) assigns PRO the same index as the matrix subject in (24) and the matrix object in (25) and (26) as determind by the properties of the matrix verb (Chomsky and Lasnik 1977 : 441).

The sentences (4) and (5) have the base structure (28). The *for* complementizer must delete after the verb *want*. This is effected by a dialect specific filter. In (5), *for* may optionally delete by (23).

(28) $[_{VP}V[_{\bar{S}}for[_{S}NP \text{ to } VP]]]$

Epistemic verbs such as *believe* and *think* require a null complementizer in their infinitive complement (Chomsky and Lasnik 1977 : 442). The zero morpheme should not be confused with the identity element *e*.

(29) $[_{VP}believe[_{\bar{S}}\phi[_{S}NP \text{ to } VP]]]$

Not all infinitival constructions are the structure of obligatory control. Thus see (29).

Infinitival relatives such as (7) are derived in the following way.

(30)   a. $[_{NP} \text{ a man } [_{\bar{S}}[_{COMP} for][_{S} \text{ who to fix the sink}]]]$

        b. $[_{NP} \text{ a man } [_{\bar{S}}[_{COMP} \text{ who for}][_{S} \text{ t to fix the sink}]]]$

        c. $[_{NP} \text{ a man } [_{\bar{S}}[_{COMP} e][_{S} \text{ t to fix the sink}]]]$

        (Chomsky and Lasnik 1977 : 462)

(30a) is the underlying structure. NP movement (22) gives (30b), and the deletion rule (23) effects (30c).

The filter (31) blocks the ungrammatical sentences from (8) to (18).

(31)   *To* Filter :

        $^{*}[_{\alpha} NP \text{ to } VP]$, unless α is adjacent to and in the domain of $^{2}[-N]$ or $\alpha =$ NP, where the feature $[-N]$ holds of verbs and prepositions.

        (Chomsky and Lasnik 1977 : 464)

Notice that the feature $[-N]$ does not hold of adjectives in general. Therefore, the infinitival complements of adjectives require the presence of *for*. The complementizer *for* shares the feature $[-N]$ with the preposition *for* (Chomsky and Lasnik 1977 : 459). In the case of an infinitival construction with *for*, the subject NP of the infinitive is in the domain of *for* because the branching node most immediately dominating *for*, $\bar{S}$ also dominates this NP. In (12) the phrase *Bill to win* is not adjacent to the verb *bother*, nor in its domain. The sentences (14), (15), (16) and (17) fall under the same constraint. *To* Filter (31) ignores PRO because filters apply only to indexed NPs. This filter also blocks the ungrammatical sentence (32). The phrase *a man to fix the sink* is an NP in (7). In(6) ϕ complementizer optionally deletes, so that *Bill* becomes adjacent to the verb.

(32)   *we informed (appealed to) Bill [Harry to leave]

        (Chomsky and Lasnik 1977 : 441)

I claimed above that ME "bare" infinitival construction has a much wider distribution than in presentday English. Visser 1966 gives a detailed analysis of this construction in Old English and Middle English. According to him, this construction is classified as follows.

(33)   Type 'god ys *us* her *to beconne*'
                   (Visser II, p. 954)
(34)   Type '*A man to soweyn* kokyl betoknith euelis and stryf'
              '*I (for) to bear* this is some burden'
                   (Ibid. p. 956)
(35)   Type 'It is perlows *a man to wt stondyn* his souerayn'
              'It is semeli *him* (for) *to knowe* all þe spicis'
                   (Ibid. p. 963)
(36)   Type 'It is a woodness *a man (for) to stryue* with a strenger'
                   (Ibid. p. 965)

I have cited only the contructions which are not allowed in presentday English.

It is obvious that Old English and Middle English belong to a different type of language from presentday English in this respect. These languages had a richer system of inflection than presentday English. This fact is very important when we consider the reason of their difference.

I do not think we should discard *To* Filter altogether in the grammar of Old and Middle English. One way to preserve this filter is to ascribe the feature $[-N]$ to zero complementizer as well as *for* and verbs. As for the structure (37), I posit the rule (38). Prepositions and their object NP could be inverted farely easily.

(37)   NP for to VP
(38)   for NP→NP for

Notes :

1 I owe the examples of presentday English to Chomsky and Lasnik 1977.

2 Node A c(onstituent)-commands node B iff the branching node most immediately dominating A also dominates B. If A c-commands B, then B is in the domain of A.

References

Chomsky, Noam. and Howard Lasnik. 1977. "Filters and Control" *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol.8, No. 3 pp. 425-504.

Visser, F. Th. 1966. *An Historical Syntax of The English Language II* Leiden : E. J. Brill.